

REMARKS

Applicant has amended the Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14, and the title. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments to the claims and the title are supported by the application as originally filed and do not contain any new matter. Therefore, the Final Office Action will be discussed in terms of the claims and the title as amended.

The Examiner has objected to the title. Applicant has amended the title as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner has objected to some minor informalities in the claims, and Applicant has corrected the claims to remove these informalities from the Claims 13 and 14.

The Examiner has rejected the Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In view of the amendment to the Claim 14, Applicant respectfully submits that it now complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Moon et al., stating that Moon et al. discloses each and every element of Applicant's claimed invention.

In reply thereto, Applicant would like to incorporate by reference Applicant's comments contained in Applicant's responsive amendment sent December 9, 2004. In addition, Applicant would like to point out that on January 12, 2005, Applicant submitted a Supplemental Amendment making some amendments to the claims which are also reflected in the present amended claims.

In addition to the above, Applicant would like to point out that in Applicant's invention, the transfer trigger condition is described in the electronic mail, and therefore, the transfer trigger condition is not added or modified later by the sender.

With the above in mind, Applicant has carefully reviewed Moon et al., and respectfully submits that in Moon et al., the trigger condition is previously set in a communication terminal unit, but not in the electronic mail. Therefore, such trigger condition is independent of the electronic mail and does not contain the element of Applicant's invention described above.

Still further, in Applicant's invention, the server apparatus observes or watches the

event information, which is an element of the transfer trigger condition, and when the event information is changed to establish the transfer trigger condition, the electronic mail is transferred to the communication terminal unit of the destination which has been set in the electronic mail. Applicant respectfully submits that this element of Applicant's invention is also not contained in Moon et al.

In view of the above, therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Moon et al. does not contain each and every element of Applicant's invention as claimed by Claim 1 and that Claim 1 is not anticipated thereby.

The Examiner has further rejected the Claims 2-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Moon et al. in view of Lazaridis et al., stating that Moon et al. teaches all of Applicant's invention except for specifically teaching allocating an individual identification code to said registered electronic message, and thereafter sending said transfer trigger condition corresponding to the registered electronic mail message together with said allocated identification code to the predetermined destination communication terminal unit; Lazaridis et al. teaches placing an outer wrapper about the original message and by providing the addressing information on the communication terminal unit to be transferred; and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moon et al. in view of the teachings of Lazaridis et al.

In reply thereto, Applicant would like to incorporate by reference his comments above concerning Applicant's invention and Moon et al. In addition, Applicant would also like to incorporate by reference his comments made to this same rejection contained in Applicant's responsive amendment sent December 9, 2004. In addition, Applicant would like to again point out that on January 12, 2005, Applicant sent a Supplemental Amendment amending the claims, and Applicant's arguments are based upon the claims as amended by that Supplemental Amendment and incorporated into the amended claims in this Rule 116 Amendment. Still further, Applicant's review of Lazaridis et al. indicates that the placing of the outer wrapper and providing the addressing information of the mobile device only occurs when the mail is being redirected in Lazaridis et al. In contrast thereto, in Applicant's invention, the identification is sent from the destination communication terminal to the

communication terminal to be transferred, and on receiving the automatic transfer command from the destination communication terminal unit, transfer is completed.

In view of the above, therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination suggested by the Examiner is not Applicant's invention, and that Claims 2-15 are not obvious over Moon et al. in view of Lazaridis.


Applicant further respectfully and retroactively requests a one-month extension of time to respond to the Final Office Action, and respectfully requests that the extension fee in the sum of \$120.00 be charged to KODA & ANDROLIA DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 11-1445.

In view of the above, therefore, it is respectfully requested that this Rule 116 Amendment be entered, favorably considered, and the case passed to issue.

Please charge any additional costs incurred by or in order to implement this Rule 116 Amendment or required by any requests for extensions of time to KODA & ANDROLIA DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 11-1445.

Respectfully submitted,

KODA & ANDROLIA

By: 
William L. Androlia
Reg. No. 27,177

2029 Century Park East
Suite 1140
Los Angeles, CA 90067-2983
Tel: (310) 277-1391
Fax: (310) 277-4118

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office Fax No. (571) 273-8300 on August 25, 2005.

William L. Androlia

Name

8/25/2005

Signature

Date